CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator:		Team:	CCRB Case #:	☐ Force	☐ Discourt.	☐ U.S.
Sara Griffin		Squad #5	201705299	✓ Abuse	O.L.	☐ Injury
Incident Date(s)		Location of Incident:		Precinct:	18 Mo. SOL	EO SOL
Friday, 06/23/2017 9:00 AM		§ 87(2)(b)		34	12/23/2018	12/23/2018
Date/Time CV Reported		CV Reported At:	How CV Reported:	Date/Time	Received at CCI	RB
Thu, 06/29/2017 3:01 PM CCRB		CCRB	In-person		Thu, 06/29/2017 3:01 PM	
Complainant/Victim	Туре	Home Address				
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command			
1. SGT Douglas Perez	3323	943667	034 PCT			
Witness Officer(s)	Shield N	o Tax No	Cmd Name			
1. POM Carlos Pages	15802	957929	034 PCT			
Officer(s)	Allegatio	on		Inve	estigator Recon	nmendation
A.SGT Douglas Perez	Abuse: S	ergeant Douglas Perez e	entered § 87(2)(b)			
§ 87(4-b) § 87(2)(9)						

Case Summary

On June 29, 2017, § 87(2)(b)	filed this compla	int in person at the C	CRB. On June 23,
2017, at 9 AM, § 87(2)(b) a	nd her brother, § 87(2)(b)	got into a v	erbal dispute inside
their apartment located at 87(2)(b)			. § 87(2)(b) and
§ 87(2)(b) were alone inside	e the apartment. After th	e dispute, § 87(2)(b)	returned to her
bedroom and took a shower. Wh	nile § 87(2)(b) was i	n the shower, she hea	ard her brother break
the mirror in the bathroom. Afte			
and informed him of the dispute	and the broken mirror.	§ 87(2)(b) called 9	11 and reported that
§ 87(2)(b) was violent, had	broken a mirror, has a n	nental history, had tal	ken crystal
methamphetamine, and that there	*	*	\mathcal{C}
to get dressed for work when sh		* *	C
apartment. § 87(2)(b) opene			
including Sergeant Douglas Per		•	
living room (Allegation A). Aft			
dispute, Sgt. Perez instructed of			97/3\
	ere handcuffed and esco	rted out of the apartn	nent and transported
to the 34 th Precinct. § 87(4-b), § 87(2)(9)			
·			

There is no video footage of the incident.

no notice of claim filed by §87(2)(b)

This case exceeded the 90-day benchmark due to difficulties in scheduling the subject officer for an interview.

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- This complaint was not suitable for mediation, due to \$87(2)(b) s arrest.
 [\$87(2)(b)] [\$8 86(1)(3)&(4)] [\$87(2)(c)]
 (Board Review 2).
 An October 10, 2017, inquiry into the Office of the New York City Comptroller revealed
 - Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories
- This is \$87(2)(b) s first CCRB complaint (Board Review 3).
- Sgt. Perez has been a member of the NYPD for 10 years. Sgt. Perez is the subject of 3 prior complaints, involving 5 allegations. None of the allegations have been substantiated. §87(2)(9)
 (Board Review 4).

Page 2

CCRB Case # 201705299

Potential Issues

• The investigation was unable to obtain a sworn statement from §87(2)(b)
During her interview, § 87(2)(b) indicated she
had no contact information for \$87(2)(b) and did not know the current whereabouts
of \$87(2)(b) On June 30, 2017, the undersigned investigator emailed Department of Homeless Services in an attempt to identify if \$87(2)(b) was in a shelter. On June
30, 2017, Department of Homeless Services responded to the inquiry and confirmed
was not in a shelter and that no contact information was on file for him. On
July 17, 2017, the undersigned investigator called §87(2)(b) and §87(2)(b) s
stepfather, § 87(2)(b) , as it was discovered through the Event Information that he
initially requested police respond to the location. §87(2)(b) did not have any contact information for §87(2)(b) On July 31, 2017, the undersigned investigator called §87(2)(b)
\$87(2)(b) who stated she had not had contact with her brother since June 23, 2017.
Findings and Recommendations
Explanation of Subject Officer Identification
• Sgt. Perez was identified as the highest-ranking officer at the location § 87(2)(9)
Allegation A –Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Douglas Perez entered 887(2)(b)
It is undisputed that \$87(2)(b) and \$87(2)(b) engaged in a verbal dispute while home alone in their apartment. It is undisputed that after speaking to \$87(2)(b) \$87(2)(b) called \$911 and reported that \$87(2)(b) was violent, had a mental history, had taken crystal methamphetamine, had broken a mirror, and that there were knives in the apartment (Board Review 5). It is also undisputed that officers responded to a call of an "Emotionally Disturbed Person" at the location, and that Sgt. Perez entered the apartment. \$87(2)(9)
testified (Board Review 6) that the verbal dispute with her brother had ended prior to taking a shower. After showering, \$87(2)(b) heard what sounded like "a lot of people storming" into her apartment. \$87(2)(b) opened the bedroom door and saw approximately 10-12 police officers standing in her living room speaking to her brother. \$87(2)(b) did not hear a knock on the front door prior to the officers "storming" into her apartment.
Sgt. Perez testified (Board Review 7) that he responded to a "violent EDP" at the location. The apartment door was closed and screaming could be heard from inside the apartment. Sgt. Perez knocked on the door. Sa7(2)(b) opened the door and pointed to Sa7(2)(b) whom was inside the apartment, and stated she wanted him out of the apartment. Sgt. Perez took Page 3

CCRB Case # 201705299

pointing at \$87(2)(b) and asking the officers to remove him as indication \$387(2)(b) was consenting for them to enter the apartment. The apartment appeared in a state of disarray.
PO Pages testified that (Board Review 8) upon arrival to the apartment, Sgt. Perez knocked on the door. PO Pages did not hear any noise coming from inside the apartment. \$\frac{887(2)(0)}{2}\$ opened the door. PO Pages did not recall if or what \$\frac{887(2)(0)}{2}\$ said when she opened the door. PO Pages did not recall if \$\frac{887(2)(0)}{2}\$ verbally consented or indicated with body language that the officers were allowed to enter. PO Pages stated that due to the nature of the radio call being an "EDP" that they were going to go inside to investigate. PO Pages testified that officers are required to enter a premise if they receive a call for an "EDP."
Although, \$87(2)(b) testified that she did not open the apartment door or give consent, Sgt. Perez and PO Pages were consistent in their testimonies that \$87(2)(b) opened the apartment door. However, the officers' testimonies were inconsistent in regards to the body language \$37(2)(b) exerted upon opening the door, which Sgt. Perez interpreted as consent to enter the apartment.
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)
Page 4

CCRB Case # 201705299

Squad: 5			
Investigator: _	Signature	Print	 Date
Squad Leader: _	Title/Signature	Print	Date
Reviewer: _	Title/Signature	Print	 Date